

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17755

ship interest in capital or profits. These individuals are also precluded from obtaining certain gift and estate tax advantages which are provided under the present law with respect to distributions from qualified retirement plans.

Every reasonable effort has been made to keep the revenue loss at a minimum and still retain the essential features of the bill. The bill should certainly deserve much wider support as a result of the committee's amendments. In view of these amendments, I would hope that the Treasury Department too would now see fit to support the bill.

Mr. President, the first bill on this subject was introduced some 11 years ago in the 82d Congress, and similar bills have been introduced in each succeeding Congress. The bill before us has been pending on the Senate Calendar for almost a year. The farmers, professional people, and small businessmen who are so deserving of this relief must not be put off any longer. Involved is a basic question of justice and fairplay for some 7 to 10 million American citizens who would be affected by the bill. Simple justice requires that H.R. 10 be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 10) was read the third time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the Senate I should like to make an unusual request, which is not to be considered as a precedent. In view of the fact that work is piling up, I should like to ask unanimous consent that there be a yeas-and-nays vote on the question of passage of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, has the bill been read the third time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the bill has been read the third time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest to the majority leader that there is a sufficient number of Senators in the Chamber now to order the yeas and nays.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thought there were not. I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from New York for saving me embarrassment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BORRUM]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MILLER (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a live pair with the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BORRUM], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY] would each vote "yea."

The respective pairs of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and that of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BORRUM] have been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 4, as follows:

[No. 248 Leg.]

YEAS—75

Allott	Gruening	Mundt
Bartlett	Hart	Muskie
Beall	Hartke	Pastore
Boggs	Hayden	Pearson
Burdick	Hill	Pell
Bush	Holland	Prouty
Butler	Hruska	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Robertson
Capehart	Javits	Russell
Carlson	Johnston	Saltonstall
Carroll	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Chavez	Jordan, Idaho	Smathers
Church	Keating	Smith, Mass.
Clark	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Kerr	Sparkman
Cotton	Kuchel	Stennis
Curtis	Long, Hawaii	Talmadge
Dirksen	Mansfield	Thurmond
Dodd	McCarthy	Tower
Eastland	McClellan	Wiley
Ellender	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Fong	Monroney	Yarborough
Fulbright	Moss	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—4

Douglas	McNamara	Morse
Gore		

NOT VOTING—21

Aiken	Engle	Magnuson
Anderson	Goldwater	Miller
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Morton
Bible	Hickey	Murphy
Borrum	Lausche	Neuberger
Cannon	Long, Mo.	Symington
Case	Long, La.	Young, Ohio

So the bill (H.R. 10) was passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H.R. 10) be printed with the amendment of the Senate; and that in the engrossment of the amendment of the Senate to the bill the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make all necessary technical and clerical changes and corrections, including corrections in section, subsection, and so forth, designations, and cross-references thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. BENNETT conferees on the part of the Senate.

## LIST OF SECURITIES HELD BY SENATOR SCOTT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am including in this statement a list of securities held by me. Most of these were inherited from my father in 1952.

In two instances I hold 200 shares of securities valued below \$50 a share, and the remainder represent an average below 100 shares each.

My assets can be reliably stated to be less than 5 percent of that of my senior colleague.

17756

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 7

The list of securities is as follows: U.S. E-bonds, Anken Chemical, Champion Spark Plug, Burroughs Corp., General Motors, State of Israel bond issue, Simulmatics, United States Steel, National Bank of Fredericksburg, Capitol Hill Associates, City Tavern Association.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to ask my friend from Pennsylvania how he computed the 5-percent figure.

Mr. SCOTT. If I stated that to the Senate I would have to say that it came from various conversations with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania a year or 2 ago.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to say to my friend that I believe his figure is highly inaccurate, but that my statements to him were accurate.

Mr. SCOTT. My holdings are somewhat less than 5 percent of those of my senior colleague.

Mr. CLARK. Quite to the contrary.

Mr. SCOTT. I did discuss this statement with my senior colleague before I made it, except as to the actual percentage involved.

#### SOVIET ARMS IN CUBA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, since the first reports of the arrival of Soviet arms and so-called advisers in Cuba, many distinguished Senators, and members of the other body as well, have shown their concern over our national security through lengthy and penetrating analyses of the whole Cuban situation. All these statements have been well-documented and have raised questions to which answers are imperative. In this manner, Congress has truly underlined its historical capacity to question and examine administration policies and to offer serious and well-thought-out alternatives. For taking such swift, yet pertinent and well-advised, action, every Senator and Congressman who has participated in the Cuban debate should be highly commended.

But there are still some who say that concern by Republicans over Cuba is guided solely by political considerations. Such an analysis of the situation could not be further from the truth. To be sure, critical opposition, due to the nature of our party system, is a responsibility of the minority party. But this in no way prevents such opposition from being an intelligent and constructive contribution to a discussion of our Nation's security. Critical opposition by the minority is initiated by concern over the welfare of our country.

It is the duty of the minority party to review the administration's policies point by point, to compare them with the facts at hand, and to list the contradictions and discrepancies such comparison reveals. This point is summarized well in the editorial by Mr. Arthur Krock in today's New York Times. He comments: "It is the duty of the political opposition to bring the administration's handling of the Cuban problem into the area of political debate, so long as this is done responsibly. That,

not a moratorium of silence, will uphold the democratic principle of the people's right to information on which alone they can base an intelligent conclusion."

Mr. President, because of the significant commentary it contains on partisan politics and foreign policy, I now ask unanimous consent that Mr. Krock's editorial be reprinted in the RECORD, together with an article on the Cuban situation from the Cuban Student Directorate of Miami, Fla.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ROLE OF PARTISAN POLITICS IN FOREIGN POLICY

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, September 6.—Senator MANSFIELD's expression of hope that the administration's Cuba policies will be excluded as an issue between the major parties in this year's political campaign aims at a goal which, for several good reasons, is impossible to attain. Foremost among these reasons is that foreign and domestic affairs have become inseparable in the age of the cold war and the contraction of the entire planet into the range of nuclear missiles. The gravity of the Cuban situation is a direct product of these.

Until or unless, therefore, President Kennedy should announce in the course of the congressional campaign that the situation in Cuba endangers our national security, and takes the military countermeasures such a judgment would require, it is the duty of the political opposition to bring the administration's handling of the Cuban problem into the area of political debate, so long as this is done responsibly. That, not a moratorium of silence, will uphold the democratic principle of the people's right to information on which alone they can base an intelligent conclusion.

What the Senate majority leader has proposed is a familiar interpretation of the true application of bipartisan foreign policy by spokesmen of the party in power. For years this has been expressed in the slogan that "Politics stops at the water's edge," but conveniently construed by administration spokesmen to mean that criticisms of foreign policy are improper and unpatriotic in an immediate contest for votes. Yet except in the time of actual war or a national combat status this interpretation has never been accepted by the party out of power or by the American people as a whole. And it is not likely to be in this year's campaign, if the President's latest evaluation of the problem created by the Soviet Union's military aid program for Cuba endures that long.

The late Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan, was the principal agent in making bipartisanship in foreign policy a postwar Republican precept. Since his death he has been cited repeatedly by whichever was the party in power as an advocate of the course Senator MANSFIELD has now proposed with respect to Cuba. The Republicans charged that Vandenberg's bipartisan principle was violated by the attacks of Mr. Kennedy as the Democratic presidential candidate of 1960 on the foreign policies and acts of the Eisenhower administration. Democratic campaigners this year can be expected to make the same charge against Republican candidates who assail this administration's record in dealing with Cuba.

#### VANDENBERG'S OWN DEFINITION

But the Democrats can no more rely on Vandenberg to sustain that position than the Republicans could in 1960. On January 5, 1950, the Senator wrote the following definition in his diary: "To me bipartisan

foreign policy means a mutual effort, under our indispensable two-party system, to unite our official voice at the water's edge so that America speaks with maximum authority against those who would divide and conquer us and the free world. It does not involve the remotest surrender of free debate in determining our position. On the contrary, frank cooperation and free debate are indispensable to ultimate unity. In a word, it simply seeks national security ahead of partisan advantage. Every foreign policy must be totally debated \* \* \* and the loyal opposition is under special obligation to see that this occurs."

Vandenberg emphasized this reservation even more emphatically in his last diary entry, about the middle of February 1950, in noting the inclusion in the "New Statement of Republican Party Principles" these words he had supplied: "We shall be vigilant in critical exploration of administration foreign policy. \* \* \* We offer the American people leadership in new efforts to achieve this vital effort [to reverse] the hard fact that though they won the war nearly 5 years ago they have not yet won the peace."

And the Senator made his own Harold E. Stassen's complaint of the kind of pre-action consultation on foreign policy the Republican leaders were getting from the Truman administration—a comment applicable to the Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba: "They never bring us in before the takeoffs, just after the crash landings."

[From Cuban Student Directorate, Miami, Fla.]

#### MORE INFORMATION ON THE LANDINGS OF RUSSIAN TROOPS AND MILITARY EQUIPMENT IN CUBA—INTERNATIONAL TREATIES THAT HAVE BEEN VIOLATED BY THESE EVENTS

The cargo, consisting of arms and military equipment was unloaded at the same time that the troops were disembarking. In the majority of cases, the cargo was taken and unloaded at the very same base that the soldiers and military experts were stationed. At these bases the foreigners replaced the Cuban militia and the rebel army who previously occupied them. Thus, military strongholds are now under the absolute control of the foreign, extracontinental troops.

Reliable sources have informed that the principal objective of the Minister of the Armed Forces Paul Castro's visit to the U.S.S.R. was to obtain military aid from the Sino-Soviet bloc. An agreement was reached according to which the Communists will send to Cuba a total of 30,000 men of various nationalities.

It is definitely known that once the disembarkation has been completed, in the center and western part of the island, the distribution will be as follows:

Western army: Chinese.

Central army: Algerians, Russians, Hungarians, and Czechs.

Isle of Pines army: Africans under the command of William Galvez, from Cuban army.

The distribution arises from the fact that the commanding posts of the above-mentioned armies have been assigned officers of the same nationality as the respective troops.

Reports recently received contend that the missile stations will be finished in about 60 days. Only then are the Cubans planning to announce officially Cuba's adherence to the Warsaw Pact, signed by the Minister of the Armed Forces, Maj. Raul Castro, in his last trip to the Soviet Union.

These events, that in Cuba are public knowledge, carried out under the protection of a totalitarian dictatorship at the service of the power belonging to the Sino-Soviet bloc, constitute without doubt an extra-continental intervention in this hemisphere,

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

17757

as well as an impending threat to its peace and security. The violation of the following treaties is manifest and obvious.

The "Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance" (Rio de Janeiro, 1947), article 6; the "Letter of the Organization of American States" (Bogotá, 1942), especially articles 4 and 25; the "Declaration of the Seventh Conference of Ministers and Secretaries of State" (Punta del Este, Uruguay, 1962).

Consequently, the sanctions foreseen in articles 6 and 8 of the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance; article 30 of the Letter of the Organization of American States; and the resolution II of the Eighth Foreign Ministers Conference, should be applied in the Cuban case.

#### PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE REQUIRED IN CERTAIN CIVIL INVESTIGATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 167) to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of June 21, 1962, pp. 10570-10571, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, this is an important piece of legislation, which has been recommended by the President, the Attorney General, and the American Bar Association. In its present form there is no objection to it.

The purpose of the bill is to enable the Department of Justice to secure certain documents by way of civil demand in antitrust cases. The present procedure makes it necessary to convene a grand jury for another purpose and then get the documents in that way. The bill would alleviate that kind of procedure.

The bill as it passed the Senate contained two provisions which have been taken out by the conference. One of them provided for a demand to be made on another corporation other than the one that was under immediate antitrust investigation. In the House of Representatives an amendment was adopted which required that the one on whom the demand was made must be under investigation in an antitrust case.

Another House change removed the provision making information available to the Federal Trade Commission as well as to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice.

Personally, I thought these two provisions which were taken out of the bill were important and should not have been taken out. However, in order to reach

agreement, the Senate conferees receded and agreed to the two House amendments. Therefore, the report comes to us as the unanimous report of the conferees. I move its adoption.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This matter had long consideration in the Subcommittee on Monopoly and Antitrust Legislation and was roundly considered by the full Judiciary Committee. When it went to the House the bill was modified by the subcommittee before it finally came to the floor for action. The House recommended the bill to the House Judiciary Committee. With respect to the one amendment to which the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has alluded, we believe it is in good form, and we urge concurrence in the conference report.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the conferees, in deciding to uphold the action of the House in limiting the investigatory powers contained in the bill, focused their attention at great length on this limitation. In my judgment, and apparently in the judgment of the House and of the conference committee, the action was sound and very much to be desired. Otherwise, there would have been vested in the Department of Justice a power to ramble virtually at will into the confidential records of any business corporation. That would not have served the purpose for which the bill is designed. I am pleased that the section was inserted, and I believe the bill is the sounder for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed on.

#### MILLIONS OF AMERICANS MOVE INTO OPEN FIELD—HUNTING AREAS NEEDED MORE AND MORE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, C. R. Gutermuth, the distinguished vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute of Washington, D.C., and a leader of wildlife conservation in America, said in the September 1962 article in the American Rifleman:

Out of the cumulative experiences of past generations of American sportsmen, there has emerged the composite hunter of 1962. He comes from no particular walk of life, since hunting is one of the most cosmopolitan sports. The next hunter you meet in the field may be a bank president or a day laborer, a shop clerk or a corporation executive—it is difficult to distinguish one from the other in field clothes.

Mr. President, the Federal Government has an increasing responsibility to meet the needs of the composite hunter of 1962, as well as the needs of his children and grandchildren. We are taking some steps in that direction.

For example, a 1961 act cleared the way for use of \$105 million from the U.S. Treasury to buy wet lands for waterfowl. The Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission has set forth recommendations to help create game areas. An agreement has been made by the Departments of Interior and Defense to open and develop land around

Federal reservoirs for recreation and wildlife.

One of the facts which I regard as most significant is the statement by the Department of Agriculture that 51 million fewer acres will be needed in crop production in the United States by 1980. This is despite the certain increase in population.

Opening up of this unused cropland for recreational purposes can be a goal worthy of a forward-looking government, concerned for the needs of the people.

There are many areas where the Federal Government can work in concert with States to help provide more recreational facilities, particularly in hunting, fishing, camping, boating, and so forth.

Mr. Gutermuth has performed a great service by his article "Public Hunting in America," from an address he delivered at the NRA annual meetings in Washington, D.C., earlier this year. C. R. Gutermuth's 40 years of work in conservation and wildlife management qualifies him as one of the outstanding authorities in America. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### PUBLIC HUNTING IN AMERICA

(By C. R. Gutermuth)

Oddly, in this land of abundance, we have been showered too abundantly with explanations of why public hunting is doomed, why it is falling into disfavor with landowners, and why it is destined to become a thing of the past.

Why should people be saying that public hunting is doomed when it is among the top outdoor sports?

Personally, I do not think we are faced with any insurmountable obstacles. There are some trouble spots, to be sure. But they are few in number and can be solved if sportsmen can be awakened to the fact that public hunting, like many other sports, continually is besieged by changing factors.

People who want to hunt today and want their children to hunt tomorrow must resist being overwhelmed by these difficulties. They must single them out, evaluate their true threat, and move to correct or counteract them wherever necessary.

Hunting in America has gone through several phases. None can be outlined in sharply etched lines; each has been like a wave sweeping across the Nation in response to deep-lying social and economic forces in the American culture. Every one has left a heritage of experience that affects the thinking and behavior of the modern hunter.

The first was the pioneer phase that rolled west of the Appalachians shortly after the American Revolution, reached the Rockies before 1900, and whose backwash still can be seen, just subsiding, in Arctic Alaska and northern Canada. Hunting then was a necessity of life, with the survival of the individual and sometimes of whole settlements depending upon the skill of the hunter. Our heritage from this phase was a concept of hunting rights entirely different from that found in most European countries, where the game belongs to the landowner as fully as do his sheep, cattle, and poultry. In America, the ownership of the game, until reduced to possession by an individual, is vested in the commonwealth. This is an extension of English law, based upon the Magna Carta; but in this country it was solidified

17758

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

September 7

against the anvil of the American frontier. The point is basic to any consideration of hunting today and in the foreseeable future.

A second phase began as soon as the frontier gave way to a rural economy based upon permanent settlements and specialized skills. It was at this point that sport hunting first began to emerge. A man no longer had to hunt for meat, but if he cared to do so, or if he wished to hunt for sport, there were practically no restrictions. There were almost no game laws, and those that did exist were little enforced, if at all, and there was an abundance of open, undeveloped land to absorb the insignificant hunting pressure. Good hunting could be found on the edge of towns, posted property was almost unheard of, and farmers were tolerant of the few hunters who tramped across their fields each fall.

It was during this second phase that the concept of free hunting actually came into being. We talk much of free hunting today, but during the early 1800's it really was free, both of restrictions and of expense, other than the cost of basics—powder, shot, and horse transportation.

A third phase began soon after the turn of the century. The automobile age changed everything in America, and the institution of public hunting was not spared its influence.

Before 1900 most people in the middle class had not been able to afford the pleasures of hunting. The workweek was 6 days, from 9 to 12 hours each day. Except for rural residents who could steal a day or a few hours from their chores, sport hunting was a luxury enjoyed by the well-to-do, a pastime for youngsters, and sometimes a necessity for the very poor. The great masses of the middle class never had time to enjoy hunting until the machine age liberated them from economic drudgery and gave them, in the mass-produced automobile, a mobility and leisure that their fathers scarcely could have visualized.

## CONCEPTS UPSET

This mechanization upset all of the earlier concepts of public hunting, especially near cities. In earlier times, a farmer glancing out from his milkshed might have seen two or three hunters on his land in the course of a week, and he usually knew who they were. After the development of the automobile, he was confronted with, what seemed to him, an army of strangers, many of whom had little conception of rural courtesy, and some of whom were surly and handled firearms carelessly. The farmer fell back on his age-old rights and posted his property, an act that squeezed the displaced hunters over on the lands of more tolerant neighbors who already were overburdened with uninvited guests. Other shooters sought out the remaining undeveloped lands that were shrinking rapidly under the expansion of the human population.

Game populations also suffered under the mounting hunting pressures, and it soon became obvious that some form of rationing would be required to spread the supply among the growing number of hunters and to carry a breeding stock through to spring. From this came the closed season, the bag limit, the outlawing of unsportsmanlike hunting practices, and the end of market shooting. All of these reforms had been tried in several States, but they did not receive general acceptance until well into the 20th century.

Before 1900, most of the States relied upon the local and county police to enforce their game laws. The officers usually were too preoccupied with problems in town to do much patrolling in woods and fields. This finally led to the appointment of special law-enforcement staffs under the authority of State game and fish commissioners. Game wardens originally were paid from a share of fines levied against violators, but

flagrant abuses under that system soon caused most States to put their officers on a salaried basis. To pay the expense of these officers, a direct tax, in the form of the hunting license, was levied against the sportsman.

This was another significant development. It gave the hunter a financial stake in the wildlife resources that was shared by no other segment of the public. If it had been decided that State game commissions should have been financed from general funds, the story of modern wildlife management might have been different.

The Federal Government entered the picture in 1900 with the passage of the Lacey Act, which, among other things, prohibited the interstate shipment of game taken in violation of State laws. It elevated the Bureau of Biological Survey, the forerunner of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, to an enforcement agency and laid the groundwork for the Migratory Bird Treaty of 1916, which firmly established the position and responsibility of the Federal Government in wildlife affairs.

From pure law enforcement, the various State agencies branched out with more positive programs designed to increase rather than merely save wildlife. This was spurred by sportsmen who had found that protection alone was not enough to assure a daily bag of the kind to which the hunters of those days were accustomed.

## GAME FARMS ESTABLISHED

Inspired by the success of the ringnecked pheasant introduction in Oregon shortly after 1881, some States established game farms to extend the range of the newcomer. Many were successful, and artificial propagation was shifted to native species in an effort to supplement breeding stocks. That trial-and-error process wasted both money and effort. Pen-raised quail were dumped into coverts already filled with quail; elaborate and unsuccessful attempts were made to raise ruffed grouse; pheasants and chukar partridges were released far and wide, and most of them disappeared almost as soon as they left the delivery crates.

To protect the game still further, vermin control programs were promoted, and bounty payments, initiated originally to protect livestock, were made for all conceivable enemies of game birds and mammals. The buck law was initiated as a cure-all in deer management. Winter feeding of wildlife was advocated, and set the table for predators and pestilence.

These simple, direct approaches were accepted avidly by the sportsmen. They were things that the people could do themselves to help increase the game supply. Organizations and individuals threw themselves into the task, raising and releasing game, feeding birds, and shooting hawks and crows. When those methods failed to produce the desired results, the sportsmen often urged their legislatures to reduce their own hunting privileges with closed seasons, reduced bag limits, and other restrictions.

All of the above needs to be known to gauge where we are and where we are going. Actually, this latter phase in the development of American hunting consolidated the moral and financial responsibility of the sportsmen toward the wildlife they hunted. Those of you in my age bracket who did much of your early hunting during that period will remember it with nostalgia. The antagonism of landowners toward hunters that characterized its opening years was alleviated considerably by educational programs sparked by the leading sportsmen's magazines and by national sportsmen's organizations like the Old American Game Protective Association and the Izaak Walton League of America. Those private efforts were bolstered by liaison work and active campaigning by the State fish and game

departments, and, as soon as the earlier conflicts had been resolved, there was plenty of elbow room for all.

That was a period of liberal open seasons and bag limits, and of self-sacrifice on the part of sportsmen. Every hunter thought that he knew exactly what should be done to increase the supply of game, and there were few wildlife biologists to disillusion him.

What might be called the modern phase of American hunting began about 1933, when Aldo Leopold published his book, "Game Management," and brought into existence an entirely new approach toward wildlife production. His theory, based on the reproductive characteristics of the wildlife species in relation to the natural environment, upset completely many of the old ideas and practices that had been so popular in the past. It accounted for the failures of many restocking efforts and of artificial feeding. If the environment, or habitat, was not suitable, Leopold said, it was useless to try to introduce birds through stocking. If local covers already were filled to capacity with wild cottontails, it was wasteful to try to increase the population still further by dumping additional half-fame rabbits. The way to increase wild creatures was to expand the habitat, and the natural reproduction of the native populations would occupy it fully.

This theory was accepted by most of the State agencies, and it formed the basis for modern wildlife management. Many sportsmen also accepted the new concept, even though watching pheasants fly from a release box had been a more satisfying experience than planting multiflora hedges and waiting for results. In some States, however, the administrators found themselves saddled with firmly established bounty payments, game farms, and buck laws, all legacies from earlier days that they willingly would have discarded in favor of the new and more modern practices.

In 1937, Congress enacted the Pittman-Robertson Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act and, in so doing, provided the most useful tool yet devised for augmenting wildlife. It allocated the 11 percent excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition to the States under a formula based on both the land area and number of hunting licenses sold in each State. With the required 1-to-3 matching funds from State game departments, Pittman-Robertson provided the money to do such remarkable things as accelerate the return of deer hunting in many Eastern States, greatly expand the numbers and range of the pronghorn antelope in the West, and make the chukar partridge a relatively common game bird in areas too dry to support native species. It provided public shooting areas and refuges and developed much information on wildlife diseases, food habits, and habitat needs. Without Pittman-Robertson aid, hunting definitely would be much less rewarding today.

## SPECIAL LICENSES AND PERMITS

Three years earlier, in 1934, Congress had passed the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act, which provided funds for the establishment of waterfowl refuges directly from the pockets of the wildfowlers. As an outgrowth of the stamp idea, many States began to require special hunting licenses and permits, in addition to their general licenses, usually earmarking the proceeds for projects to assist the species for which the permit was required. Nebraska, for example, requires upland bird hunters to purchase a special stamp, and a number of States have stamps or special big-game licenses. Virginia requires a use stamp of all hunters on the national forests within its borders, the revenue being used for habitat improvement on the Federal lands under a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Forest Service.

THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 24, 1962-7

**Soviet Technicians and Equipment En Route to Island**

## **'No Confirmation' of Reports of Russ Rocket Sites in Cuba**

The State Department said yesterday that about 15 cargo ships from communist countries were headed for Cuba, apparently taking military supplies and technicians to the Castro government.

Department spokesman Joseph W. Reap said there was

no confirmation of reports that the Communist bloc is helping construct rocket-launching sites in Cuba. But he said the cargoes apparently include military and electronic communications equipment.

The 15 ships now en route, Reap said, are in addition to 16 Red cargo vessels which unloaded at Havana in late July.

At his press conference Wednesday, President Kennedy said a "rather intensive quantity" of supplies and technicians has been moving into Cuba recently. He said the significance of the movement was being analyzed by Administration officials.

The rate of arrival of Soviet and Iron Curtain ships has been described by experts as "above average."

The vessels were unloaded under security conditions and little is known about the actual number or nature of the personnel. They are believed to be mainly technicians rang-

ing from military to agricultural. Officials said there is evidence that more technicians are arriving than leaving.

### **FOOD**

The supplies are believed to include military equipment and some food.

Cubans were told by the Castro government yesterday that "1000 more Soviet technicians" will arrive soon to help improve sagging agricultural production. The number of Russian "technicians" already in Cuba is estimated at 5500 to 6000. (UPI)

THE SUNDAY STAR 12 August 1962

*The Sunday Star*  
*Aug 12 '62*

## Foreign Troops in Cuba Refugee Witness Says

MIAMI, Fla., Aug. 11 (AP).—A Cuban refugee said today he saw foreign soldiers, presumably Russian, in Cuba this week.

He said he would welcome questioning by United States authorities on the subject.

The refugee, who declined use of his name for fear of reprisals against relatives in Cuba, said he saw 250 or 300 uniformed men near Matanzas, east of Havana, early last Sunday morning.

"They wore dark khaki uniforms with chevrons on short sleeves, and had blond hair," he told newsmen. "They appeared to be Russians or Czechs. They were not Cubans."

The refugee said the men were in a caravan of about 30 covered trucks. He saw them, he reported, when they got out at a roadside tavern.

"Presumably the trucks were headed for military camps at Rio Caminar or Camarioca in Matanzas province," he said.

He said he, his wife and small son were en route from their Matanzas province home to the Havana airport to leave for Miami.

The assertions follow a recent Miami radio report that 4,000 Russian soldiers had landed in Cuba. The Cuban government press denied the report.

### RUSSIANS DEBARK AT TWO PORTS

HAVANA, Aug. 11 (AP).—Rumors that Soviet military forces had entered the Western hemisphere last week were greeted with skepticism by foreign diplomats here. They were puzzled, however, about the unpublicized arrival of numerous Russians at two nearby ports.

Diplomats wondered why there was not the usual fanfare in the Cuban press over the debarkation of Russian citizens at Matanzas and Mariel,

two ports east and west of here, respectively.

Furthermore, only relatively brief attention was given in newspapers to the arrival of "numerous technicians at different levels" who were brought to Havana aboard a Russian liner, August 7.

No mention was made of the docking of at least three other ships at Matanzas and Mariel, between July 29 and 31.

According to Mariel town folk, authorities blocked the way to the harbor and proceeded to unload "crates about three meters long" from the Russian vessels.

They also said that between 1,500 and 2,000 "Russian or Chinese-looking" men came ashore. Some carried knapsacks, but none shouldered arms, they added.

A stevedore said no Cubans were allowed to unload the ships. Russians, stripped to the waist, loaded the crates aboard trucks, also driven by foreigners, the stevedore claimed.

Informed circles refused to give credit to widespread rumors a Russian military force had landed in Cuba.

"Another rumor," snapped a diplomat.

"It's hard to believe," another added. "There may be military instructors among them, but the actual landing of troops could certainly have unpleasant repercussions in Washington. The Russians know better."

Qualified informants did not hesitate to venture the rumors could have a certain grain of truth.

### Floods Isolate British

KENDAL, England, Aug. 11 (AP).—Floods swept roads in the Lake District of Northern England today and brought traffic chaos. Many roads were impassable in the area.



## Slaps at Capehart

# JFK Rejects Invading Cuba

By **RICHARD H. BOYCE**  
Scripps-Howard Staff Writer

**L**IKE a good schoolboy President Kennedy recited what the Monroe Doctrine means to him:

"It means what it has meant since Monroe's time, that we oppose foreign powers' extending their power into the Western hemisphere."

Altho the Monroe Doctrine has long been interpreted as meaning the United States would regard any such extension as an act of aggression "dangerous to our peace and safety," Mr. Kennedy clearly stated at his press conference yesterday:

"I am not for invading Cuba at this time."

### NO HIDDEN MEANING

He said there was no hidden meaning in the phrase "at this time." And he took a gentle slap at Sen. Homer Capehart (R., Ind.), who had called for a U. S. invasion of Cuba, by saying:

"Statements like that made in a casual way could lead to very serious consequences for many people."

The President explained what this country is doing about the Soviet flouting of the Monroe Doctrine with its economic and military aid to Castro's Cuba.

He pointed to the cutting off of U. S. trade with Cuba

and the "isolation of the communist menace." And he said the United States is "consulting" with NATO-member countries which have leased ships to the Soviet Union for carrying goods to Castro.

"Countries associated with us in NATO should reconsider their position" in this leasing of ships to the communists, the President said.

### NO EVIDENCE

The President also insisted there has been "no evidence" of Soviet troops in Cuba. There may be military technicians, he said, but no troops "in the sense that the word troops is generally understood."

U. S. officials have revealed that between 3000 and 5000 Soviet "technicians" are in Cuba and that at least half of them are military personnel.

Asked about an earlier statement by U. S. officials that there is reason to believe the Soviets gave Castro anti-aircraft missiles similar to our Nike, Mr. Kennedy said:

"We have no information yet that there are any anti-aircraft missiles in Cuba."

The officials had revealed that material unloaded in Cuba this month from Soviet ships was "compatible" with what would be needed for such missile installations. (See stories on Page 7.)